

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CHRIS JONATHAN EPPERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES CONGRESS, THE
REPUBLICAN PARTY, HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, BILL CLINTON,
BARACK OBAMA, DONALD TRUMP,
GEORGE BUSH,

Defendants.

No. 1:23-cv-01687-KES-SKO

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATION THAT PLAINTIFF'S
COMPLAINT BE DISMISSED WITHOUT
LEAVE TO AMEND**

(Docs. 11, 17)

Plaintiff Chris J. Epperson, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed a complaint on December 5, 2023. Doc. 1. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On January 18, 2024, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's complaint and, because it failed to state a cognizable claim, ordered him to either file an amended complaint, file a notice that he intended to stand on the initial complaint, or file a notice of voluntary dismissal. Doc. 9. On January 22, 2024, plaintiff filed a first amended complaint. Doc. 11. On March 15, 2024, plaintiff lodged a proposed second amended complaint. Doc. 14. On April 3, 2024, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that this action be

1 dismissed without leave to amend due to plaintiff's repeated failure to state a cognizable claim.
2 Doc. 17. The magistrate judge pointed out that the complaint appears to be vaguely related to the
3 assassination of John F. Kennedy and lists as defendants several deceased presidents and
4 Vladimir Putin. *Id.* at 5. With basically no discernible factual allegations and no explanation of
5 how any defendant's action violated his rights, plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim. *Id.* On
6 April 8, 2024, plaintiff timely filed a two sentence objection stating, without any specifics, that he
7 objected to the findings and recommendations and intended to appeal. Doc. 20.

8 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this court has conducted a de
9 novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the file, including plaintiff's objections, the
10 court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper
11 analysis.

12 The court also notes that, since the issuance of the findings and recommendations,
13 plaintiff has filed a flurry of motions and notices, most of which are completely unrelated to the
14 findings and recommendations. *See* Docs. 23, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 47. For example,
15 one motion is a California application for appointment of guardian ad litem, *see* Doc. 28 – an
16 application which is misdirected to this court and has no relation to the underlying complaint. In
17 any event, each motion and other filing is rendered moot by this order.

18 Accordingly:

- 19 1. The findings and recommendations issued on April 3, 2024, Doc. 17, are adopted in
20 full;
- 21 2. This action is dismissed without leave to amend due to plaintiff's failure to state a
22 cognizable claim; and
- 23 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

24
25
26 IT IS SO ORDERED.

27 Dated: September 30, 2024

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28